



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,038	06/02/2001	Sanjay Lal	004906.P080	4240

8791 7590 07/14/2004

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER
----------

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/873,038

Applicant(s)

LAL, SANJAY

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2154

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kranich et. al. (Hereafter Kranich) in view of Yoshioka et. al. 6,425,039 (Hereafter Yoshioka), as per paper number 7.
4. Claims 1, 8, 12, 17, 21 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brenner, JR. et. al. US Patent application publication 2002/007131, June 13, 2002 (Hereafter Brenner) in view of Browning et. al. 6,006,247 (Hereinafter Browning), as per paper number 7.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (1) Kranich and Yoshioka do not disclose "a processor to determine an identification of the processor based on a query that is internal to the processor". The examiner

Art Unit: 2154

disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Kranich teaches the well known concept of the use of a processor that processes queries related to both internal and external to the processor in order to help determine the identification of the processor (e.g., use of internal and external registers, col., 1, line 13 – col., 2, line 33). Therefore examiner believes that the claimed limitations are taught by the prior art.

Applicant argues (2) Kranich and Yoshioka do not disclose, “a processor to read a bit within an internal register to determine an identification of the processor in the multiprocessor system”. The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Kranich teaches the well known concept of the use of a processor that processes queries related to both internal and external to the processor in order to help determine the identification of the processor (e.g., use of internal and external registers, col., 1, line 13 – col., 2, line 33). Therefore examiner believes that the claimed limitations are taught by the prior art.

Applicant argues (3) Brenner and Browning do not disclose “a processor to determine an identification of the processor based on a query that is internal to the processor”. The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Browning teaches the well known concept of the use of a processor that processes queries related to both internal and external to the processor in order to help determine the identification of the processor (e.g., use of internal and external registers, col., 1, line 20 – col., 3, line 11). Therefore examiner believes that the claimed limitations are taught by the prior art.

Applicant argues (4) Brenner and Browning do not disclose, “a processor to read a bit within an internal register to determine an identification of the processor in the multiprocessor system”. The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Browning teaches the

Art Unit: 2154

well known concept of the use of a processor that processes queries related to both internal and external to the processor in order to help determine the identification of the processor (e.g., use of internal and external registers, col., 1, line 20 – col., 3, line 11). Therefore examiner believes that the claimed limitations are taught by the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (703) 605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached at (703) 305-8498.

Application/Control Number: 09/873,038

Page 5

Art Unit: 2154

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Haresh Patel

July 9, 2004



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100